

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

ANTHONY WILKERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHARLES DANIELS, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:20-cv-00531-MMD-WGC

ORDER

This action began with a *pro se* civil rights complaint filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by Anthony Wilkerson, a former state prisoner. On June 8, 2021, this Court issued an order directing Wilkerson to file his updated address and a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis* with this Court within 30 days. (ECF No. 3.) The 30-day period has now expired, and Wilkerson has not filed his updated address, filed a non-prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case. *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action, with prejudice, based on a party's failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules. See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (affirming dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (affirming dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring *pro se* plaintiffs to keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming dismissal for failure to

1 comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1424 (9th Cir. 1986)
2 (affirming dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

3 In determining whether to dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey
4 a court order, or failure to comply with local rules, the court must consider several factors:
5 (1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to
6 manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the defendants; (4) the public policy favoring
7 disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the availability of less drastic alternatives.
8 See *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423-24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at
9 130; *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260-61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.

10 Here, the Court finds that the first two factors, the public's interest in expeditiously
11 resolving this litigation and the Court's interest in managing the docket, weigh in favor of
12 dismissal. The third factor, risk of prejudice to Defendants, also weighs in favor of
13 dismissal, since a presumption of injury arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay
14 in filing a pleading ordered by the court or prosecuting an action. See *Anderson v. Air*
15 *West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976). The fourth factor—public policy favoring
16 disposition of cases on their merits—is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of
17 dismissal discussed herein. Finally, a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey
18 the court's order will result in dismissal satisfies the "consideration of alternatives"
19 requirement. *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132-33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d
20 at 1424. The Court's order requiring Wilkerson to file his updated address and file a non-
21 prisoner application to proceed *in forma pauperis* with the Court within thirty (30) days
22 expressly stated: "IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, if [Wilkerson] fails to timely comply
23 with this order, this case may be subject to dismissal without prejudice." (ECF No. 3 at 2.)
24 Thus, Wilkerson had adequate warning that dismissal would result from his
25 noncompliance with the Court's order to file his updated address and a non-prisoner
26 application to proceed *in forma pauperis* within thirty (30) days.

27 ///

28 ///

1 It is therefore ordered that this action is dismissed without prejudice based on
2 Wilkerson's failure to file an updated address and a non-prisoner application to proceed
3 *in forma pauperis* in compliance with this Court's June 8, 2021, order.

4 The Clerk of Court is therefore directed to close this case.

5 DATED THIS 18th Day of August 2021.

6
7 

8 _____
9 MIRANDA M. DU
10 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28